



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and that some of the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus might also have been omitted and the space utilized for the earlier Babylonian period.

The translations as a whole are satisfactory. The rendering of the historical inscriptions, more particularly, represents an improvement on previous translations. It is a pity, however, that the printing was begun too late to change the erroneous reading "Ramman" into the now established reading "Adad." In the case of the religious texts, there are, of course, many passages in regard to which different opinions still prevail, and some of the interpretations proposed in such productions as the Gilgamesh epic and the Maklu and Shurpu texts are open to question; but this is inevitable in this branch of Babylonian literature, and it would be ungracious to single out certain points for criticism where so much that is valuable and correct is offered. Dr. Muss-Arnolt and Dr. C. D. Gray, to whom, with Professor Harper, we owe most of the translations in the "religious" division, deserve the gratitude of scholars as well as of the general reader. Harper's translations of historical texts evince the careful work that he has likewise bestowed upon this division, and special attention should be directed to Dr. Christopher Johnston's happy interpretations of the many very difficult passages in the Assyrian and Babylonian Letters.

Apart from the place which this volume occupies in the series "The World's Great Books," of which it forms a part, a selection in English of the remarkable literary productions of Babylonia and Assyria was badly needed, and it is now possible, thanks to Professor Harper and his associates, to gather a very fair estimate of this literature. This volume of selections ought to be specially welcome as a supplement to histories of the ancient East. The study of history is lamentably incomplete without at least a survey of the literature pertaining to any country or to any period, and it is to be hoped that the volume under consideration will be given the place it deserves in the college and university curriculum as an indispensable "source-book" in the study of one of the most important sections of ancient history.

MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH'S JOB.¹

This is not merely a new translation, but a philological edition of the book of Job with brief introductions to each of the component parts, concise explanatory footnotes, and a full philological commentary. The latter notes, in a general part (A, pp. 125-37), (1) the peculiarities of the vocabulary of Job, (2) the Aramaic character of the language, and (3) the condition of the text, and gives in a special part (B, pp. 137-79) philological notes on the different passages.

¹ DAS BUCH HIOB NEU ÜBERSETZT UND KURZ ERKLÄRT. Von Friedrich Delitzsch. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. 179 pp.; small 8vo.

It was during a stay in Constantinople in the spring of 1901 that Professor Delitzsch conceived the plan of treating the text of the book of Job afresh and without prejudice, in accordance with strictly philological principles. The unexpected result of his study was that *the text of the book of Job is preserved in a very reliable manner in the Old Testament* (p. 3). This refers to the consonantal text (p. 133). That it is, however, not without mistakes Delitzsch admits frankly, and groups these in five different categories (pp. 133–5). This conclusion holds good likewise of the vocalization, though here also a goodly number of corrections have to be made, which Delitzsch classifies (pp. 135–7).

After the commentary and translation of Duhm, in which the subjective criticism had gone well-nigh to the extreme with its multitude of conjectures and emendations, this assertion of the general reliability of the Massoretic text comes as a great surprise. Whatever may be the final verdict of time, it cannot be doubted that Delitzsch makes his assertion good in many cases. Often he does so by merely considering the context more acutely, as, *e. g.*, in 37:21, where he translates בָּהָרִי “*verdüstert*,” “darkened,” which meaning the context *required*, for the meaning “bright” is impossible without some transpositions. Delitzsch’s rendering,

*Und nun (zum Schluss): sie sahen kein Licht, verdüstert war
es von Wolken —
aber ein Wind, der dahinfuhr, klärte sie auf—*

is excellent; especially as the Syriac ܒܗܪܝܐ, ܒܗܪܝܐ *obscurus* confirms it. Or he shows by keener observation of the root meaning and the usage of the words that emendations are unnecessary. *E. g.*, in 6:25 the stem מִרְיָן means “to be heavy and to be hard,” so that the passage gives good sense in MT., “How *effective* are truthful words!” (so also Budde, *ad loc.*; *cf.* also *New Hebrew Lexicon*, s. v. מִרְיָן); or in כֶּסֶף תִּיעָפֹת “best, finest silver, of the best quality,” from תִּיעָה “to tower, excel.”

How much is still to be learned from Assyriology is again strongly brought out in this book, which elucidates the meaning of many Hebrew words and usages by Assyrian and Babylonian parallels. By means of them it is sometimes shown that the suggestions of former scholars which were made largely on the strength of the context are philologically tenable; *e. g.*, אַפִּיק, 12:21, which Dillmann, Baethgen, *et al.* translated “the strong” or “the powerful,” is proved to be correct by the Assy. epêku, a synonym of danânu. The Assy. emêsu must be added in the *New Hebrew Lexicon* under חֲמִס, for it is its equivalent as to form, meaning, and usage, 15:33.—But not only on such cases does Assyriology throw fresh light. The Assy. nakātu shows that the forms of נָקַט should not be treated as anomalous forms of קָנַט, 10:1, but as coming from נָקַט. To שָׁמַר “to rage, be angry,” as a stem different from שָׁמַר “to keep, to watch,” as was advocated by me in this

JOURNAL (April, 1901) for Amos 1:11, Delitzsch refers also Job 10:14. It may be noticed here that there is an exact parallel in the synonym נָטַר, where also two stems should be distinguished, the one meaning "to keep," the other "to rage," the Assy. *naṭāru* being the equivalent of the second. It should be written נָטַר in Delitzsch's *HWB.*, and not נָרַר.

There are a good many Hebrew roots which Delitzsch thus elucidates. The etymologies of קָדַשׁ, 1:5; יָתַר, 6:9; מָלַל, 14:2; סוּחַ, 2:3; לָחַט, 41:13; טָהַר, 38:36, and others will prove to be correct for the most part. It is of course not to be expected that all of them will be accepted. It is doubtful, *e. g.*, whether גִּיל, 3:22, which Delitzsch compares with Dan. 1:10, where it has the meaning "age," implies the *end* of the time, though Delitzsch is right when he says that גִּיל goes back to "Zeitumlauf," "circle of time;" but whether this is equivalent to "Zeitablauf" I am not sure. Nor am I sure whether Delitzsch is right in his treatment of חָלַט, 14:10 (*cf.* forthcoming *Journal of Biblical Literature*). On מוֹרָה, 36:22, *cf.* this JOURNAL (April, 1901). The suggestions on עָשׂ, 4:19; שָׁפַי, 33:21; תָּרַ, 31:35, and others are in the nature of the case not absolutely certain, but they are very ingenious and incline one strongly in their favor. In fact, there is scarcely any suggestion in this book which could be dismissed off-hand. The translation of 5:5, for instance, "*Dem der Hungrige seine Ernte frass und in Körben mit wegnahm*" (reading אֶל־מִצְנִים [MT. אֶל־מִצְנִים, מִצְנָן = "basket"), is the best suggestion I have seen, and the most plausible one also.

Another valuable observation is, that the prepositional connections should be more carefully noticed. Again the Assyrian stands Delitzsch in good stead, when he compares, *e. g.*, נָסַע בּ, 7:21, with *ina* (= ב) in connection with the verbs of "fleeing" and "escaping" in Assyrian.

How true is the observation that the failure to notice idiomatic phrases has occasioned not only "*schülermässige*" translations, but many unnecessary emendations! Delitzsch has kept his eye open for these; he points them out, for instance, in אָכַל בָּרִים (18:13) = "*stückweise verzehren*," עָדִירָצָה (14:6) = "*nach Belieben*," מִשְׁנֵה פָנָיו (14:20) = "*im Umsehen*."

Wherever one turns one finds fruitful suggestions and valuable hints in these philological notes, and also in the pointed explanatory footnotes; in the Assyrian and Babylonian parallels of religious ideas and usages, as well as in the brief but valuable introductions to the different component parts of the book of Job.

In view of all this it does not weigh heavily that the translation might now and then be improved; for instance, 6:16, it cannot well be said of brooks "*sobald sie bedrängt werden*," "*verglommen sie spurlos*;" and in 6:30 "*ist mein Gaumen gefühllos für Unheil*?" is rather infelicitous.

Nor will Delitzsch's depreciation of LXX as being of very little use in matters of textual criticism detract much from the value of his book.

He has, perhaps, more scholars who agree with him in this respect than he is aware of. Whether he is, however, right in declining its help altogether is another question. And yet one is glad that he does for once.

Nor will many grudge him his cautious reserve in regard to the metrical and strophical questions, and not a few will subscribe to his declaration on p. 16.

In regard to the composition of the book Delitzsch distinguishes "The Poem of Job or the Canticles of Pessimism" ("*das Hohelied des Pessimismus*"), chaps. 3-31, 38-42:6 (B.), on the one hand from "The Folk-Story of the Pious Man Job," chaps. 1, 2, 42:7-17 (A.), on the other hand from "The Speeches of Elihu," chaps. 32-37 (C. I.), and "The Origin of Wisdom," chap. 28 (C. II.), and from "The Ostrich, Hippopotamus, and Crocodile," 39:13-18; 40:15-41:26 (C. III). These last three (C. I, II, III) he classifies under "Appendices."—Within the poem Delitzsch recognizes as additions 9:8-10; 12:6; 13:16; 15:30a, and transposes 5:4, 5 to 5:5, 4; 17:3, 4 he puts at the end of chap. 16; 22:8, 9 to 22:9, 8; 31:38-40 after 31:8.—But in regard to this whole question much remains yet to be done, as Delitzsch also recognizes.

This notice will, it is hoped, have shown that we have here a book brimful of suggestions. Delitzsch does not claim to have solved all riddles; he also has to put many question marks, and sometimes he is bold enough not even to dare a guess. But his work is all the more valuable for that. So much can confidently be said that this book marks a distinct advance in the philological criticism of Job, and it is to be hoped that Professor Delitzsch will give us such a philological edition of other Old Testament books also in the near future. The book may be had without the philological commentary, for it is intended, not merely for scholars, but for "all those who are still interested in biblical matters;" but the scholar cannot afford to do without it, for here he finds the reasons for the translation.

JULIUS A. BEWER.

NEW YORK CITY.